

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 11, 12, and 16 through 23 are pending, with Claims 11, 17, and 20 being independent. Claims 11, 12, 17, 18, and 20 through 22 have been amended. Claim 23 has been added.

Claims 11, 12, 16 through 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 4,013,339 (Ando, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 3,942,862 (Furukawa, et al.) and 5,107,293 (Sekine, et al.). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ando, et al., Furukawa, et al., and Sekine, et al., and further in view of newly-cited U.S. Patent No. 3,514,192 (de la Cierva). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 recites, inter alia, a sensor for detecting a shake of the apparatus, in combination with a correction system for correcting an shake of the image due to the shake of the apparatus, by using (a) an output from the sensor and (b) a shake correction optical system in the front optical system, wherein the shake correction optical system is arranged between (a) the erecting prism and (b) the closest one to the side of the object among the plurality of lens elements of the front optical system.

Claim 17 recites, inter alia, a sensor, arranged in a body of the apparatus, for detecting a shake of the apparatus, in combination with a control circuit electronically connected to the sensor, for receiving an output from the sensor, and an actuator electrically connected to the control circuit, the driving of the actuator being controlled in accordance with an output from

the control circuit, responsive to an output from the sensor, wherein a shake correction optical element connected to the actuator is arranged between (a) the erecting prism and (b) the closest one to the side of the object among the plurality of lens elements of the front optical system.

Claim 20 recites, inter alia, a sensor for detecting a shake of the apparatus, wherein the closest one to the erecting prism, among the plurality of optical elements of the front optical system, suppresses a shake of an image of the object, the image being created by the front optical system, the erecting prism, and the rear optical system, the suppression being in accordance with an output from the sensor.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of Ando, et al., Furukawa, et al., Sekine, et al., and de la Cierva, even in combination, assuming, arguendo, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed combinations of claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 11, 17, and 20.

Applicant respectfully submits that Ando, et al. and Furukawa, et al. lack sensors as claimed. In this regard, Applicant respectfully notes that Ando, et al. discloses, e.g., inertial stabilization, and that such stabilization is wholly silent as to any suggestion of a sensor as claimed, let alone a correction system for correcting a shake by using an output from such a sensor. Meanwhile, Applicant respectfully notes that Furukawa, et al. discloses, e.g., a stabilizer G such as a gyroscope, which, like Ando, et al., is wholly silent as to any suggestion of a sensor as claimed, let alone a correction system for correcting a shake by using an output from such a sensor.

The Official Action therefore relies upon Sekine, et al. with respect to a circuit for detecting shake. This reliance is respectfully traversed by Applicant. Applicant respectfully notes that Sekine, et al. states in its Abstract, e.g., “A camera using this device is arranged to correct the shaking of the camera on the basis of the result of a computing operation performed on a camera shake detected from the signal produced from the image sensor together with a camera shake physically detected by means of an accelerometer”, and Sekine, et al. discloses use of, e.g., a VAP, with controlling the AS driving circuit according to the shaking degree of the image to offset the image shake (e.g., col. 4, lines 31 through 48). However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither the VAP nor the remainder of Sekine, et al. provides either a description or a suggestion of the aforementioned combination of claimed features including (1) arranging the shake correction optical system (Claim 11) or shake correction optical element (Claim 17) between (a) the erecting prism and (b) the closest one to the side of the object among the plurality of lens elements of the front optical system as variously recited in Claims 11 and 17, and (2) the closest one to the erecting prism, among the plurality of optical elements of the front optical system, suppresses a shake of an image of the object as recited in Claim 20.

Applicant respectfully notes that de la Cierva discloses, e.g., an image compensating element A and a color correcting element B. However, Applicant respectfully submits that de la Cierva fails to remedy the deficiencies of the aforementioned documents.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the

art to arrive at the above-discussed combinations of claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 11, 17, and 20.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/dc